



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/820,044

04/08/2004

Jordan Willard Hawkwood Glazier

32185-201793

7322

26694

7590

08/23/2007

VENABLE LLP

P.O. BOX 34385

WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER

TRAN, TRANG U

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/23/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,044

Applicant(s)GLAZIER, JORDAN WILLARD
HAWKWOOD**Examiner**

Trang U. Tran

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7-11 and 13-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5,7-11 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some.* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed June 06, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re pages 7-9, applicant argues that the invention to the present application is not obvious in light of Herz as evidenced by the long felt unsolved need to find remote controls for radios, personal computers, robots, garage doors, MP3 players, and interactive video game playing devices, this is the failure of others to satisfy this need to provide a location signal generator on a remote for a radio, personal computer, robot, garage door, MP3 player, or an interactive game playing device, and Herz teaches away from these claims.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner has pointed out what each of the prior art references teaches and has indicated how and why these references would have been combined to arrive at the claimed invention. The expected benefits from the well known universal remote controller for radios, personal computers, robots, garage doors, MP3 players, and interactive video game playing devices would themselves have been evidence of obviousness. Expected beneficial results are themselves evidence of obviousness. Expected beneficial results are themselves evidence of obviousness. In re Hoffman, 556 F.2d 539, 194 USPQ 126 (CCPA 1977); In re Skoll, 523 F.2d 1392, 187 USPQ 481 (CCPA 1975); and In re Skoner, 517 F.2d 947, 186 USPQ 80 (CCPA 1975).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 5, 7-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herz (US Patent No. 6,407,779 B1).

In considering claim 5, Herz discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) an electrical device system comprising: (a) an electrical device is met by the TV 220 (Figs. 1-2 and 4, col. 3, lines 8-27), 2) the claimed (b) an activator installed in the device is met by the remote finder switch 408 which for the user to activate the remote finding feature (Figs. 2 and 4, col. 4, lines 32-48 and col. 15, lines 36-55), 3) the claimed (c) a remote control for the device is met by the remote control block 210 (Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 28-55), and 4) the claimed (d) a location signal generator installed in the remote control, which signal generator is activated by receipt of a wireless signal from the activator in the electrical device is met by the beeper 219 which is activated and produces a sound to indicate the location of the remote control (col. 15, lines 36-55). However, Herz does not specifically disclose that the electrical device is one of: a radio, a personal computer, a robot, a garage door, and MP3 player, and an interactive video game playing device.

It is noted that the capability of using universal remote controller to control one of radio, personal computer, robot, garage door, MP3 player, and interactive video game playing device is old and well-known in the art and; therefore, Official Notice is taken.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the well know using universal remote controller to control one of radio, personal computer, robot, garage door, MP3 player, and interactive video game playing device into Herz's system in order to using a single remote controller to control plurality of different devices.

In considering claim 7, the claimed wherein the location signal generator is at least one of: (a) a flashing light; and (b) a sound generator is met by the beeper 219 which is activated and produces a sound to indicate the location of the remote control after receiving the remote control locator signal from the television, or a flashing LED, instead of a beacon sound, can be used for indicating the location of the remote control (col. 15, lines 36-55).

In considering claim 8, the capability of using switch to set to sound only; flashing light only; and both sound and flashing light is also old and well known in the art. Therefore, Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known selecting switch into McGonigal et al's system in order to simplify the process of finding the location of the remote control.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 5 above.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 5 above.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 8 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 1 is allowed.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7358. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 20, 2007



Trang U. Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622